APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,993	01/20/2001	Suresh Madhavan	34058-8002.US01	1210

22918   7590   10/03/2007
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. BOX 2168
MENLO PARK, CA 94026

EXAMINER
BOYCE, ANDRE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 July 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3,6,7,9,11-19 and 22-89</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3,6,7,9,11-19 and 22-89</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This Final office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed July 20,

2007. Claims 6, 7 and 55 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 11-19 and 22-

89 are pending.

2.   The previously pending rejection to claim 55 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, has been withdrawn.

3.   Applicant's arguments filed July 20, 2007 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

4.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   Claims 1, 2, 9, 11, 12, 14-19, 22, 23, 27, 29, 31-35, 45, 46, 48-53, 57, 61-63, 69-

71, 73-80 and 84-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Nummelin et al (USPN 6,308,164).

As per claim 1, Nummelin et al disclose a method, comprising: receiving a

plurality of communications from at least one of a first plurality of business contexts

on the network (i.e., distributed project management system 100, including a data

transport system for transferring data between workstations and primary database,

column 6, lines 50-53), wherein the business contexts include a virtual space with an

associated shared purpose, wherein decisions are made in the virtual space to

further the purpose (i.e., email messages used to communicate project information

between workstations and the database server in order to transfer data objects and

status data objects to and from the primary database, column 6, lines 53-58);

transmitting the plurality of communications, and actions associated with the

communications to at least one of a second plurality of business contexts on the

network (i.e., email messages used to communicate project information between

workstations and the database server in order to transfer project data objects and

status data objects to and from the primary database, column 6, lines 53-58);

receiving a plurality of responses to the communications from at least one of the

second plurality of business contexts (i.e., receiving information from project

resources regarding the status of project tasks, column 6, lines 37-39); and receiving

at least one link between at least one of the plurality of responses and at least one of

the plurality of communications from at least one of the second plurality of business

contexts (i.e., resource used to complete the task and a task status, column 6, lines

37-40), wherein the at least one of the plurality of responses facilitates further

specifying an aspect of said at least one of the first plurality of business contexts or

said at least one of the second plurality of business contexts (i.e., status data object

transferred to the database, column 6, lines 56-58); wherein at least one of the

communications and the responses includes at least one subject matter of the at

least one of the communications and the responses (i.e., project data and project

status objects, column 6, lines 56-58).

As per claim 2, Nummelin et al disclose transmitting the plurality of requirements,

the plurality of responses, and the at least one link to at least one of the first plurality

of business contexts (update of the primary database 112, via the enterprise network

and transfer of data between workstations 120 and 130, column 6, lines 31-34 and

50-53).

As per claim 9, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the communications and

the responses includes at least one of: an input to the at least one of the

communications and the responses, and an output from the at least one of the

communications and the responses (e.g., resource as input and task completion as

output).

As per claim 11, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the communications and

the responses includes a security level that determines which users may view the at

least one of the communications and the responses (i.e., access level of the user at

a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task and resource

information, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 12, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the communications and

the responses includes identifications of users that may (1) add, delete, and edit

information included in the at least one of the communications and the responses,

and (2) add, delete, and edit at least one child communication or response to the at

least one of the communications and the responses and information included in the

child communication or response (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation,

wherein a project resource would not be given access to project manager functions,

column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 14, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the communications and

the responses includes at least one of a labor cost (i.e., resource cost, column 9,

lines 22-24), a material cost, and a duration.

As per claim 15, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the communications and

the responses includes at least a description of the requirement (task requirement).

As per claim 16, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the communications and

the responses includes at least a document relevant to the requirement (e.g.,

documents used as secondary information, column 10, lines 52-55).

As per claim 17, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the communications and

the responses includes a task of the project (column 9, lines 9-11).

As per claim 18, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the communications and

the responses includes a milestone of the project (e.g., task phase, column 9, lines

15-17).

As per claim 19, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the communications and

the responses includes a specification of the project (e.g., name and clients for the

project, column 9, lines 2-8).

As per claim 22, Nummelin et al disclose the first plurality of computers include

the second plurality of computers (i.e., workstation 140 functioning as either a

project manager workstation or resource workstation, column 6, lines 5-7).

Claims 23, 27, 29, and 31-35 are rejected based upon the rejection of claims 1,
9, 12, and 17-21, respectively, since they are the computer storage medium claims
corresponding to the method claims.

As per claim 45, Nummelin et al disclose a method, comprising: receiving one or
more elements of a business context from a first party (i.e., project task and
resource information input at project manager workstation 120, column 5, lines 65-
67), receiving a selection of an element of a the business context from a second
party (task creation); receiving a message concerning the selected element from the
second party (input of project, project tasks, and resources information, column 5,
lines 65-67); and saving in a database table a record including (1) the message, (2)
an identification of the message as a first key to the record, and (3) an identification
of the selected element as a second key to the record (input project information
saved in database 112, column 5, lines 55-58).

As per claim 46, Nummelin et al disclose the first record further includes (1) an
identification of another message being responded to, if any, and (2) an identification
of a third party to receive the message (i.e., identification of task status and task
resource).

As per claim 48, Nummelin et al disclose detecting the presence of the third
party; and transmitting the message to the third party (resource workstation 130).

As per claim 49, Nummelin et al disclose loading information related to the
selected element into memory database 112).

As per claim 50, Nummelin et al disclose sending an email to the second party to notify the receipt of the message (column 6, lines 53-56).

As per claim 51, Nummelin et al disclose saving in the database table a security level for the selected element that determines which parties may view the selected element received from the second party (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 52, Nummelin et al disclose saving in the database table an identification of an individual that may (1) add, delete, and edit information included in the selected element, and (2) add, delete, and edit a child element to the selected element and information included in the child element, received from the second party (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein a project resource would not be given access to project manager functions, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 53, Nummelin et al disclose saving in the database table data contained in a datasheet of an item related to the selected element received from the second party (e.g., resource creation related to the task stored in database 112).

As per claim 57, Nummelin et al disclose method, comprising: receiving a selection of an element of a business context from a first party (i.e., task creation); receiving messages in a conference concerning the selected element from one or more parties (e.g., e-mail messages transferred between workstations 120 and 130, column 6, lines 50-55); and saving in a database table a record including (1) the messages, (2) an identification of the conference as a first key to the record, and (3)

an identification of the selected element as a second key to the record (database 112).

As per claim 61, Nummelin et al disclose saving in the database table a security level for the selected element that determines which parties may view the selected element (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 62, Nummelin et al disclose saving in the database table an identification of an individual that may (1) add, delete, and edit information included in the selected element, and (2) add, delete, and edit a child element to the selected element and information included in the child element (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein a project resource would not be given access to project manager functions, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 63, Nummelin et al disclose saving in the database table data contained in a datasheet of an item related to the selected element (e.g., resource creation related to the task stored in database 112).

Claim 69 is rejected based upon the rejection of claims 57, 61, and 62, since it is the computer storage medium claim corresponding to the method claims.

As per claim 70, Nummelin et al disclose encoded with a fourth field comprising a level of responsibility of the individual (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein a project resource would not be given access to project manager functions, column 6, lines 7-11).

Claim 71 is rejected based upon the rejection of claim 57, since it is the computer

storage medium claim corresponding to the method claim.

As per claim 73, Nummelin et al disclose the message includes emails (column

6, lines 53-56).

As per claim 74, Nummelin et al disclose a third field of an identification of

another message being responded to, if any (e.g., task resource).

As per claim 75, Nummelin et al disclose a third field of an identification of a party

to receive the message (e.g., task resource).

As per claim 76, Nummelin et al disclose method comprising receiving from a

first business context a linkage between a response and a requirement, wherein said

requirement includes an element of a second business context to be implemented

and said response includes a proposal to implement the requirement (e.g., project

manager 120 inputs project task to be completed, wherein project resource 130

receives task assignment receipt by project resource 130).

As per claim 77, Nummelin et al disclose receiving from said first business

context said response (e.g., resource responding to task requirement).

As per claim 78, Nummelin et al disclose receiving from said first business

context said requirement (e.g., project manager inputting resource information).

As per claim 79, Nummelin et al disclose each of said responses and

requirement includes a human language description of a vision of said second

business context (e.g., project definition 320, figure 3).

As per claim 80, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of said requirement and said response includes at least one of: a labor cost (i.e., resource cost), a material cost, and a duration.

As per claim 84, Nummelin et al disclose the communications are implicit or explicit (i.e., explicit communications between workstations and database, column 6, lines 50-53).

As per claim 85, Nummelin et al disclose the business contexts are fed by content, knowledge, and decisions to further the purpose (i.e., email messages used to transfer project data objects and status objects, column 6, lines 53-58).

As per claim 86, Nummelin et al disclose linking said one of the first plurality of business contexts or said one of the second plurality of business contexts to a third business context, wherein the third business context carries definitions (i.e., project task and project resource information linked via task assignments, wherein project task information carries definitions, column 5, lines 65-67).

As per claim 87, Nummelin et al disclose the communication is selected from the group consisting of: an identification of a risk, a mitigation for a risk, a proposed action item, an issue to resolve, a deliverable, a milestone, an agenda for a meeting, a meeting, and start-end dates (i.e., information about when task was started, progress of the task, and completion, column 6, lines 39-41).

As per claim 88, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the communications and the responses includes a request for information associated with at least one of the business contexts (i.e., status inquiry of project data).

As per claim 89, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the communications and the responses includes financial and cost information (i.e., project costs, column 7, lines 60-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   Claims 3, 6, 7, 24-26, 28, 36-44, 47, and 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nummelin et al, in view of Formenti (USPN 6,487,469).

As per claim 3, Nummelin et al does not explicitly disclose the plurality of communications is organized as nodes in a first hierarchical tree structure and the plurality of responses is organized as nodes in a second hierarchical tree structure. Formenti discloses a scheduling application that enables a project manager the capability of arranging project tasks and sub-tasks in a hierarchical structure linking the relationships between the tasks in a tree structure (column 4, lines 27-31). Both Nummelin et al and Formenti are concerned with effective management. Further, Formenti discloses schedule database 30 using Microsoft Project (column 4, lines 23-26), as also disclosed by Nummelin et al, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the plurality of requirements organized as nodes in a first hierarchical tree structure and the plurality of responses is organized as nodes in a second hierarchical tree structure in Nummelin et al, as seen in Formenti, thus providing an efficient means of organizing the tasks and resources.

As per claim 6, Nummelin et al disclose users are assigned a security level that determines if the user may view, edit, or delete a node and information included therein (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 7, Nummelin et al disclose users are assigned to at least one node so the user may (1) add, delete, and edit information included in the at least one node, and (2) add, delete, and edit at least one child node to the at least one node and information included in the at least one child node (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task, sub-task, and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

Claims 24-26 and 28 are rejected based upon the rejection of claims 3 and 6, respectively, since they are the computer storage medium claims corresponding to the method claims.

Claims 36 and 37 are rejected based upon the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 and 3, since they are the user interface claims, corresponding to the method claim, wherein the project data and status data objects (column 6, lines 53-58) are the metadata associated with the business context.

As per claim 38, Nummelin et al disclose a status of compliance between the third list and the linked at least one requirement (e.g., task status and progress towards completion, column 6, lines 39-41).

As per claim 39, Nummelin et al disclose a description of the at least one interaction in the third list (e.g., task description, including sequence relationship, column 9, lines 11-14).

As per claim 40, Nummelin et al disclose the link between the at least one interaction and the at least one requirement indicates that the at least one interaction is directed to meet the at least one requirement (e.g., resource created to complete task).

As per claim 41, Nummelin et al disclose at least one of the interactions and responses is a task (column 9, lines 9-11), a milestone, a component specification, a deliverable, or a procurement.

As per claim 42, Nummelin et al disclose a graphical representation of a link between at least one requirement from the first list and at least one interaction from the second list linked (e.g., spreadsheet used as secondary information fields and values, column 10, lines 52-55).

As per claim 43, Nummelin et al disclose a security level required for a user to view, edit, or delete one of the requirements and the interactions and information therein (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 44, Nummelin et al disclose a user assigned to (1) add, delete, and edit information included in the at least one of the requirements and the interactions, and (2) add, delete, and edit at least one child requirement or interaction to the at least one of the requirements and the interactions and information included the at

least child requirement or interaction (i.e., access level of the user at a workstation, wherein project managers may input project task, sub-task and resource information, column 6, lines 7-11).

As per claim 47, Nummelin et al disclose detecting the presence of the third party (e.g., resource workstation 130). Nummelin et al does not explicitly disclose transmitting a hierarchical tree of the business context to the third party, wherein the selected element is distinguished by one or more visual cues including underscore, color, and shading. Formenti discloses a scheduling application that enables a project manager the capability of arranging project tasks and sub-tasks in a hierarchical structure linking the relationships between the tasks in a tree structure (column 4, lines 27-31). Further, Microsoft Project including underscoring, shading and/or coloring. Both Nummelin et al and Formenti are concerned with effective management. Further, Formenti discloses schedule database 30 using Microsoft Project (column 4, lines 23-26), as also disclosed by Nummelin et al, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include transmitting a hierarchical tree of the project to the second party, wherein the selected element is distinguished by one or more visual cues including underscore, color, and shading in Nummelin et al, as seen in Formenti, thus providing an efficient means of organizing the tasks and resources.

As per claim 58, Nummelin et al disclose receiving a selection of the conference by a second party (e.g., e-mail messages transferred between workstations 120 and 130, column 6, lines 50-55). Nummelin et al does not explicitly disclose transmitting

a hierarchical tree of the business context to the second party, wherein the selected element is distinguished by one or more visual cues including underscore, color, and shading. Formenti discloses a scheduling application that enables a project manager the capability of arranging project tasks and sub-tasks in a hierarchical structure linking the relationships between the tasks in a tree structure (column 4, lines 27-31). Further, Microsoft Project including underscoring, shading and/or coloring. Both Nummelin et al and Formenti are concerned with effective management. Further, Formenti discloses schedule database 30 using Microsoft Project (column 4, lines 23-26), as also disclosed by Nummelin et al, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include transmitting a hierarchical tree of the project to the second party, wherein the selected element is distinguished by one or more visual cues including underscore, color, and shading in Nummelin et al, as seen in Formenti, thus providing an efficient means of organizing the tasks and resources.

As per claim 59, Nummelin et al disclose transmitting the message to the second party (e-mail message to resource workstation 130).

As per claim 60, Nummelin et al disclose loading information related to the selected element into memory (database 112).

7.   Claims 13, 30, 54-56, 64-66, 67, 68, 81, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nummelin et al, in view of Desjardins (US 2002/0059512).

As per claim 13, Nummelin et al does not disclose at least one of the communications and the responses includes at least one of: a description of at least one risk, a description of at least one mitigation, and a link between at least one risk and at least one mitigation. Desjardins discloses defining the basic feature of a project, including a risk analysis, which includes documenting the constraints and assumptions involved in the project (¶ 0050). Both Nummelin et al and Desjardins are concerned with effective project management, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include risk analysis in Nummelin et al, as seen in Desjardins, thereby further defining the features of the project, thus making Nummelin et al more flexible and robust.

Claim 30 is rejected based upon the rejection of claim 13, since it is the computer storage medium claims corresponding to the method claims.

As per claims 54-56, Nummelin et al does not disclose saving in the database table an identification of a risk received from the second party, saving in the database table an identification of a mitigation received from a third party, and saving in the database table a link between the risk and the mitigation. Desjardins discloses defining the basic feature of a project, including a risk analysis, which includes documenting the constraints and assumptions involved in the project (¶ 0050), and the system implemented using system 200, saving information in database 212 (¶ 0130). Both Nummelin et al and Desjardins are concerned with effective project management, therefore it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include risk analysis in Nummelin et al, as seen in Desjardins, thereby further defining the features of the project, thus making Nummelin et al more flexible and robust.

As per claims 64-66, Nummelin et al does not disclose saving in the database table an identification of a risk received from the first party, saving in the database table an identification of a mitigation received from a second party, and saving in the database table a link between the risk and the mitigation. Desjardins discloses defining the basic feature of a project, including a risk analysis, which includes documenting the constraints and assumptions involved in the project (¶ 0050), and the system implemented using system 200, saving information in database 212 (¶ 0130). Both Nummelin et al and Desjardins are concerned with effective project management, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include risk analysis in Nummelin et al, as seen in Desjardins, thereby further defining the features of the project, thus making Nummelin et al more flexible and robust.

Claim 67 is rejected based upon the rejection of claims 57 and 64-66, since it is the computer storage medium claim corresponding to the method claims.

As per claim 68, Nummelin et al does not disclose the first record further comprises a criticality level of the risk. Desjardins discloses defining the basic feature of a project, including a risk analysis, which includes documenting the constraints and assumptions involved in the project (¶ 0050). Both Nummelin et al and Desjardins are concerned with effective project management, therefore it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include risk analysis in Nummelin et al, as seen in Desjardins, thereby further defining the features of the project, thus making Nummelin et al more flexible and robust.

Claims 81 and 82 are rejected based upon the rejection of claim 13, since they are the graphic user interface claims, corresponding to the method claim.

8.   Claim 72 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nummelin et al.

As per claim 72, Nummelin et al does not explicitly disclose the message includes a content of an online conference. However, Nummelin et al disclose transferring data between workstations 120 and 130, including email messages transferred between workstations, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the message having content from an online conference in Nummelin et al, as an additional means of transferring information between workstations 120 and 130, thereby making the system more flexible.

9.   Claim 83 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nummelin et al, in view of Desjardins, in further view of Formenti.

Claim 83 is rejected based upon the rejection of claim 3, since it is the graphic user interface claim, corresponding to the method claim.

Response to Arguments

10.   In the Remarks, Applicant argues that neither Nummelin et al, Desjardins, nor

Formenti are valid prior art according to 35 U.S.C. § 102. The Examiner respectfully

disagrees and submits that Applicant seems to have misinterpreted 35 U.S.C. § 102.

First, as indicated by Applicant, the present application was filed on January 20,

2001. Nummelin et al was filed April 28, 1997 and USPN 6,308,164 issued October

23, 2001. As stated in MPEP § 706.02(a), "[i]n order to determine which section of

35 U.S.C. 102 applies, the effective filing date of the application must be determined

and compared with the date of the reference" (emphasis added). As such, the

effective filing date of Nummelin et al is April 28, 1997.

Moreover, 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) states "(e) the invention was described in (1) an

application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United

States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an

application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty

defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an

application filed in the United States only if the international application designated

the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English

language" (emphasis added).

As such, Nummelin et al is indeed qualifies as prior art because it is "a patent

granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the

invention by the applicant for patent." In addition, Formenti (USPN 6,487,469), filed

November 10, 1999, with an effective filing date of November 13, 1998 also qualifies

as prior art because it is "a patent granted on an application for patent by another

filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent."

In addition, Desjardins (US 2002/0059512) was filed October 16, 2001, with an

effective filing date of October 16, 2000. As such, Desjardins qualifies as prior art

because it is "an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another

filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent," as seen in

35 U.S.C. § 102(e), quoted above.

With respect to claim 72, Applicant argues that the Examiner has failed to show

in Nummelin et al content of an online conference. The Examiner submits that as

seen in the rejection, Nummelin et al does not explicitly disclose the message

includes a content of an online conference. However, Nummelin et al disclose

transferring data between workstations 120 and 130, including email messages

transferred between workstations, therefore it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the

message having content from an online conference in Nummelin et al, as an

additional means of transferring information between workstations 120 and 130,

thereby making the system more flexible. As such, the Examiner is not relying on

personal knowledge.

Conclusion

11.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and

any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing

date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply

expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Andre Boyce whose telephone number is (571) 272-

6726. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-

8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like

assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-

272-1000.

adb
September 26, 2007

BETH VAN DOREN
PRIMARY EXAMINER